



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,309	06/13/2000	Manu Kumar	000399	7378
23639	7590	11/17/2004		EXAMINER
BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP				BOUTAH, ALINA A
THREE EMBARCADERO, SUITE 1800				
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/592,309	KUMAR, MANU
	Examiner Alina N Boutah	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment received July 1, 2004.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 1, 2004 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,108,687 issued to Craig in view of USPN 6,240,444 issued to Fin et al.

(Amended) Regarding claim 1, Craig teaches an apparatus for interactive communications over a network among participants at a plurality of locations, the apparatus comprising:

a leader computer operatively connected to the network (figures 1 and 3) ;  
a computer readable storage device accessible by the leader computer, the storage device including computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network (figure 3); and

computer instructions for instructions for transmitting the information to a plurality of other computers over the network, wherein said other computers each generally simultaneously displays the transmitted information (Abstract; col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 29).

However, Craig fails to explicitly teach said computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet; and computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the modified information.

Fin teaches computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet (abstract, col. 3, lines 12 – 55); and computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display

the modified information (figured 2, 4 and 13; col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50; col. 19, line 4 to col. 20 line 7).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated incorporate the teaching of Fin into the teaching of Craig in order allow users of the internet to simultaneously collaborate web pages (col. 2 line 65 to col. 10).

Regarding claim 2, Craig teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the network comprises the Internet (col. 4, lines 12-15).

(Amended) Regarding claim 3, Craig teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network comprises a web browser (Abstract).

Regarding claim 4, Craig teaches the apparatus recited in claim 1, wherein said computer instructions for transmitting information to teach of the other said plurality from one of said plurality of computers comprises a presenter interface, the presenter interface further comprising computer instructions for communicating with each of the other of said plurality of computers and for causing information to be generally simultaneously displayed on said other computers (Figure 4; Abstract).

(Amended) Regarding claim 8, Craig teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants at two or more locations, wherein each of said

participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

a) providing a website on the computer network for said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (col. 4, lines 7-10);  
b) providing information to be displayed on each of said participants' computers during the collaborative presentation (col. 4, lines 16-29);  
c) providing means for said participants to access the website (col. 4, lines 7-10); and  
d) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the one of said participant's computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information (Abstract; col. 4, lines 16-29).

However, Craig fails to explicitly teach e) interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information; and f) sharing a web browser of one of said plurality of participants with each of the other of said plurality of participants so that the shared web browser causes the plurality of participants to collectively surf through the internet.

Fin teaches e) and f) (figured 2, 4 and 13; col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50; col. 19, line 4 to col. 20 line 7).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ e) and f) in order allow users of the internet to simultaneously collaborate web pages (col. 2 line 65 to col. 10)

(Amended) Regarding claim 9, Craig teaches a method of conducting a conference among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations over a computer network, the method comprising:

- a) providing a website on the computer network (col. 4, lines 7-10);
- b) providing means for said participants to access the website via a computer having a display (col. 4, lines 7-10);
- c) providing a browser interface for conducting the conference (Abstract); and
- d) operably connecting each said participants computers such that the display of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the shared browser interface (Abstract; col. 4, lines 16-29).

However, Craig does not explicitly teach e) providing a white board to allow each participants to change the display of the shared browser interface.

Fin teaches e) (figured 2, 4 and 13; col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50; col. 19, line 4 to col. 20 line 7). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ e) in order allow users of the internet to simultaneously collaborate web pages (col. 2 line 65 to col. 10).

Regarding claim 10, Craig teaches as recited in claim 9 further including the step of categorizing said participants into one of a presenter participant or an attendee participant, such that the presenter participants' computer controls each of said attendee participants computers via the browser interface (figure 4; col. 12, lines 55-56).

(Amended) Regarding claim 11, Craig teaches an apparatus for conducting a conference among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations over a computer network, the apparatus comprising:

- a) a website having a server computer on the computer network (col. 4, lines 7-10);
- b) computer instructions for said participants to access the website via a computer having a display (col. 4, lines 7-10);
- c) a shared browser interface for conducting the conference (figure 2); and
- d) computer instructions for operably connecting each of said participants computers such that the display of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the shared browser interface (Abstract; col. 4, lines 16-29).

However, Craig does not explicitly teach e) computer instructions for providing a white board to allow each participants to change the display of the shared browser interface.

Fin teaches e) (figures 2, 4, and 13; col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ e) in order allow users of the internet to simultaneously collaborate web pages (col. 2 line 65 to col. 10)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig in view of Fin, in further view of *Using Microsoft Powerpoint 2000* by Rutledge et al.

(Amended) Regarding claim 5, Craig teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations, wherein each of said participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

- a) providing a web site on the computer network for a said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (col. 4, lines 7-10);
- c) providing information to be displayed on each of said participant's computers during the collaborative presentation (col. 4, lines 16-29);
- d) accessing the website to the identifier means (col. 4, lines 16-29); and
- e) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the one of said participants computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information (Abstract; col. 4, lines 16-29).

However, Craig does not expressly teach f) interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information; and g) sharing a web browser of one of said plurality of participants with each of the other of said plurality of participants, so that the shared web browser causes the plurality of participants to collectively surf through the internet.

Fin teaches (f) and (g) (abstract, col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ (f) and (g) in order allow users of the internet to simultaneously collaborate web pages (col. 2 line 65 to col. 10).

Craig and Fin do not expressly teach b) sending a message to each of said plurality of participants, the message providing an identifier means for accessing the collaborative presentation. Rutledge et al. teach sending a message to each of said plurality of participants, the message providing an identifier means for accessing the collaborative presentation (Chapter 17, Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to send a message to each of said plurality of participants in order to instruct the participants to access the collaborative presentation, thus, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

Regarding claim 6, Craig teaches the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, further including the step of initiating a telephone conference call while conducting the collaborative presentation (col. 4, lines 51-55).

Regarding claim 7, Craig fails to expressly teach the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, wherein said identifier means comprises one or more of a confirmation number, and a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation. Rutledge et al. teaches said identifier means comprises a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation (Chapter 17,

Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable said identifier means to comprise a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation in order to ensure that participants will access the presentation at the specific time and date, therefore, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed July 1, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Craig nor Fin teach "computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the modified information" as recited in the amended claims 1, 5, and "computer instructions for providing a white board to allow each participant to change the display of the shared browser interface" as amended in claims 9 and 11. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Patent Office respectfully submits that these limitations are taught in figure 13 as well as col. 19, line 5 thru col. 20, line 7 of the Fin reference. Specifically, figure 13 discusses a web collaboration session between a customer and a bank agent that allows the customer and the bank agent to fill out an application form. The modified information is displayed simultaneously on the two respective computers. Col. 19, lines 34-53 discusses figure 13 in more detail. Specifically, lines 47-52 disclose an annotation 142 and a remote pointer 144 to mark and point to the areas on the application form. In this case, 142 and 144 are interpreted as "a white board" as amended in the

claimed invention. For the reasons above, the combination of Craig and Fin does teach the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejections are sustained.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am - 7:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANB



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100